

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, February 11, 1999
MAG Office
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS PRESENT

*Harry Mitchell, Citizen Representative, Chairman
*Bill Bates, City of Avondale
*Patrice Kraus, City of Chandler
*Danielle Typinski, Town of Gilbert
Doug Kukino, City of Glendale
Christine Zielonka, City of Mesa
Gaye Knight, City of Phoenix
Larry Person, City of Scottsdale
Mike Short for Mary O'Conner, City of Tempe
*Walter Bouchard, Citizen Representative
*Arve Dahl, Citizen Representative
David Feuerherd, Arizona Lung Association
*W. Knox Ramsey, Jr., Arizona Automobile Dealers
Association
Greg Witherspoon, Salt River Project
Brian O'Donnell, Southwest Gas Corporation
*Scott Davis, Arizona Public Service Company
Gina Grey, Western States Petroleum Association
Bryan Jungwirth, Regional Public Transportation
Authority
Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association
*Michael Kidd, Maricopa County Farm Bureau
*Samuel Aubrey, Arizona Rock Products
Association
*David Martin, Associated General Contractors

*Connie Wilhelm-Garcia, Homebuilders
Association of Central Arizona
H. Maynard Blumer, American Institute of
Architects- Central Arizona
Peter Allard, Valley Forward
*Ian Calkins, Phoenix Chamber of Commerce
*Monica Pastor, University of Arizona - Cooperative
Extension
*Tom Russell, Arizona Nursery Association
Pat Cupell for Stephanie Bondeson, Arizona
Department of Transportation
Phil De Nee for Randy Sedlacek, Arizona
Department of Environmental Quality
Jo Crumbaker, Maricopa County
Division of Air Pollution Control
Mark Ellery for Dennis Ehrhart, Arizona
Department of Weights and Measures
Dennis Mittelstedt, Federal
Highway Administration
*Judi Nelson, Arizona State University
*James Klinker, Arizona Farm
Bureau
B.Bobby Ramirez, Salt River Pima-Maricopa
Indian Community
David Rueckert, Citizen Representative

*Those members were neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

George Hoffman, City of Apache Junction
Mike Sundblom, Pinal County APCD
Cari Anderson, Maricopa Association of
Governments
Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of
Governments

Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of
Governments
Allan Kosecki, Maricopa Association of
Governments
Chris Voigt, Maricopa Association of
Governments

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee was conducted on Thursday, February 11, 1998. Gaye Knight, City of Phoenix, Acting Chairman, called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m.

2. Approval of the September 10, 1998 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the September 10, 1998 meeting. David Rueckert, Citizen Representative, moved, Larry Person, City of Scottsdale, seconded, and it was unanimously carried to approve the minutes from the November 12, 1998 meeting with one change. The date noted on page 3, second paragraph, third line of the minutes was changed from March 22, 1998 to March 22, 1999.

3. Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan

Cari Anderson, MAG, provided an update on the status of the MAG Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan. Results from the revised technical analysis were presented first, followed by an update of the CO Plan schedule, and a summary of requirements for a redesignation request.

The first slide summarized the number of CO exceedance days in each year from 1983 to 1998. No exceedances were recorded in the last two calendar years. The number of exceedances reached a high of 86 in 1984. The implementation of emission controls has resulted in very substantial reductions in the number of exceedances since then.

The next several slides summarized the technical analysis revised in response to public comments received on the Draft 1998 CO Plan. The analysis included the following steps: re-processing the base year inventories; re-validating the urban airshed model; re-analyzing the emission impacts of committed measures; and re-evaluating the attainment demonstration. The December 16-17, 1994 design day was retained. The 1993 and 1996 periodic inventories were compared, and the 1994 base case modeling inventory was evaluated. Revised assumptions for modeling of nonroad equipment were incorporated.

The results of the revised technical analysis were summarized next. The emission reduction needed for attainment was estimated to be 10 to 11%. The commitments in combination were estimated to produce a reduction of 10.4%, which is within the range of the amount needed for attainment. The estimated peak concentration with the commitments was 8.95 ppm, compared to the national ambient air quality standard of 9.0 ppm.

The next slide summarized the emission reductions projected for each of the committed control measures. Winter fuel reformulation (CARB Phase 2 with 3.5% oxygen) was estimated to generate a reduction of 6.8% in total CO emissions. The Phased-in I/M cutpoints was credited with a 2.7% reduction in emissions. Ms. Anderson noted that this reduction is approximately 50% of that

contained in the Draft because the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality has delayed implementation from January 1999 to January 2000. The coordination of traffic signal systems, development of intelligent transportation systems, and a one time waiver from I/M were attributed reductions of 0.6%, 0.4%, and 0.4% respectively. Emission reductions expected for deferring government activities were not assigned as the measure would affect when emissions occurred rather than their magnitude.

A pie chart summarizing the year 2000 attainment emission inventory was presented next. The largest source identified was onroad mobile sources, which is expected to contribute approximately 64.3% of the total CO emissions. This percentage corresponds to emissions of 411.6 metric tons of CO per day, which will become the emission budget for transportation conformity purposes once the Plan has been submitted. Nonroad mobile, area, and point sources are expected to contribute respectively 30.5%, 4.6%, and 0.6% of the total CO emissions in the year 2000. A map showing isopleths of ambient CO concentrations expected for the year 2000 with committed measures was also presented. The maximum concentration expected was noted as 8.95 ppm, and not 8.96 ppm as marked on the slide.

Contingency measures were addressed next. The estimated emission reduction required from these measures was 1.7%, based on an estimated 2.6% annual growth in VMT. The benefits for the package of contingency measures incorporated into the CO Plan were estimated to be 1.7%, which meets the required amount. The package of contingency measures included the following: tougher registration enforcement, catalytic converter replacement program, lawn mower reduction program, national LEV program, clean burning fireplace ordinance, Area A expansion, gross emitter waiver provision, and increased waiver repair limit. Ms. Anderson noted that the nonroad equipment standards measure has been removed due to delays in implementation by the Arizona department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ). The measure has been replaced with credit for lawn mowers scrapped in 1998 as a result of the lawn mower reduction program.

The tentative schedule for completing the CO Plan was presented as follows:

April 19, 1999	Document available for public review
May 20, 1999	Public Hearing
June 3, 1999	AQTAC Meeting
June 23, 1999	Regional Council
July 1, 1999	Submit Plan to ADEQ/EPA

An EPA finding of submittal will stop the first sanction clock. An EPA approval by April 2000 is needed to stop the Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) clock. At this point, Ms. Knight, Acting Chairman, City of Phoenix, asked what the requirements would be for a redesignation request. Ms. Anderson replied that the requirements were summarized in the next slide.

The final slide in the presentation summarized requirements for a redesignation request, based on an EPA memorandum dated September 4, 1992. The requirements are: EPA has determined that

the relevant national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) has been attained; EPA has approved the Serious Area Plan; EPA has determined that the air quality improvement is due to permanent and enforceable reductions in emissions; the state has met all applicable requirements under Section 110 and Part D; and EPA has approved the Maintenance Plan under Section 175A. Ms. Anderson noted that the area has had two years of clean data to fulfill the first requirement. She also noted that a maintenance plan would need to include a 1999 periodic inventory and demonstrate maintenance of the standard in 2010 or 2015.

Brian O'Donnell, Southwest Gas Corporation, asked what would happen if the region were to go out of attainment after the submission of the Plan and before redesignation had occurred. Ms. Anderson responded that this happened recently for the Bay Area Air Quality Management District in California, and that they were reclassified to nonattainment and had to prepare another Plan.

Maynard Blumer, American Institute of Architects, asked why measures such as vegetation and traffic calming, which had been talked about previously, were not included in the Plan. He also suggested more emphasis is needed on long range planning, instead of 'putting out fires as they come'. Lindy Bauer, MAG, answered that it has been quite a while since the list of potential measures was before the Committee. She noted that traffic calming did not make it to the short list. Mr. Blumer stated that the Committee still needed to keep pursuing those measures, as other measures such as buying natural gas powered cars were not that successful. Ms. Bauer responded that these measures can be looked at for the next series of Plans. She also noted that vegetation measures were incorporated into the Serious Area PM₁₀ Plan to stabilize vacant lots.

4. Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM₁₀

Ms. Bauer, MAG, provided an update on the status of the MAG Serious Area Particulate Plan. She addressed the use of an improved model, the current schedule, and the status of committed measures.

First, the UAM-LC model now being used by MAG is more sophisticated than the previous modeling approach used. The model runs take about 96 hours to model 120 days of the forecast year. Results from the modeling conducted using the revised model will be reported at the next AQTAC meeting.

Second, the schedule for the PM₁₀ Plan is the same as the schedule for the CO Plan. Many of the emission reduction measures are similar, as well. For the PM₁₀ Plan, a total of 78 measures were adopted. The key measure is Rule 310 by Maricopa County, which is expected to be addressed at the meeting of the County Board of Supervisors on February 17, 1999. Concern has been expressed by stakeholders regarding duplication of enforcement between Rule 310 and similar measures adopted by municipalities in the region.

MAG has conducted workshops with the stakeholders, the cities and the county to discuss the issue of duplication. As part of this process, the County has been reviewing ways in which it can do a better job of enforcing Rule 310. For municipalities, handling of complaints in a timely manner was

identified as an issue. Thanks were expressed by Ms. Bauer to all participants in the discussions, and in particular to the City of Mesa and Christine Zielonka, City of Mesa, for making numerous presentations to the stakeholders.

Finally, MAG will transmit to each member of the Committee a copy of the legal brief prepared by the Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest in their suit against the US EPA regarding the Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) for PM₁₀. The suit appears to be concerned primarily with the agricultural measures contained in the FIP. A number of questions were posed by Committee members at this point in the presentation.

Ms. Knight asked when the next Rule 310 Workshop was scheduled. Jo Crumbaker, Maricopa County Environmental Services Department, stated that the meeting was scheduled for Thursday, February 18, from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m. Ms. Crumbaker also noted that the revised version of Rule 310 was to be placed on the County website today (February 11, 1999).

Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association, commented that real improvements have been seen in the last six months in cleaning up of trackout at construction sites. Maricopa County has improved their enforcement of Rule 310. Ms. Crumbaker noted that three additional inspectors were hired in December of 1998. Three more staff are expected to be hired before July 1, 1999; additional staff will be hired after that date.

Ms. Knight asked when the final version of Rule 310 would be approved by the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors. Ms. Crumbaker indicated that it probably would be at their June 1999 meeting, as the County process for review and approval takes two or more months. Ms. Zielonka asked if the deadline for new measures was changed from April 1, 1999. Ms. Bauer replied that MAG has been working on incorporating all of the new measures in the draft Plan, noting that there were 270 pages in just one chapter on the measures committed to date. At the stakeholder meetings on local dust control ordinances, the City of Mesa had indicated that the City may eventually make revisions to the ordinance. If Mesa decides to change its ordinance, the changes would need to be provided to MAG by April 1 if Mesa would like them to be in the Plan. At this time, no other cities have indicated that they will be changing their commitments.

Ms. Zielonka asked if the draft SIP is to be available in April, and the final approved version of Rule 310 is not available at that time, will the draft SIP be released with the draft version of the Rule? Ms. Bauer indicated that the draft version is expected to be close to the final, and the final version will be incorporated into the draft version of the SIP to be approved by MAG Regional Council on June 23, 1999.

Phil De Nee, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, noted that a toll-free hotline is referenced in Rule 310, and that the public needs to be made aware of this number. Ms. Crumbaker noted that Rule 310 also requires the posting of a 4x8 foot sign listing the number at construction sites.

Mr. Blumer asked if California had recently made a decision to move away from oxygenated fuels. Ms. Bauer indicated that the EPA had formed a Task Force to address this issue. Gina Grey, Western States Petroleum Association, stated that the majority of refiners used MTBE as their first choice, but that groundwater contamination had become an issue even though the additive produced air quality benefits. A decision is expected March 5, 1999, by the Governor of California regarding the phase out of the use of MTBE as an additive.

Ms. Grey further indicated that most refiners in Arizona used ethanol as their oxygenate of choice, so MTBE would be expected to be less of an issue here. Ms. Cari Anderson, MAG, indicated that the technical analysis for the CO Plan assumed 95% ethanol and 5% MTBE usage in 1994, and 100% ethanol usage in 2000. David Feuerherd, Arizona Lung Association, indicated that research has indicated that the use of MTBE does not pose any health/lung problems. He concurred that the use of MTBE raised just a water quality issue. Ms. Knight stated that a survey could be conducted to determine local levels of use of MTBE.

5. Report on the MAG PM₁₀ Efficient Street Sweeper Workshop

Chris Voigt, MAG, reported on the results of the December 4, 1998 MAG PM₁₀ Efficient Street Sweeper Workshop. The objective of the workshop was to provide an opportunity for municipal representatives to meet with technical representatives of the major street sweeper manufacturers to discuss issues of concern regarding sweepers to be certified to the upcoming California South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) PM₁₀ Efficient standard.

The agenda included presentations from the Laki Tisopulos of the California SCAQMD, Bill Clapper of Sunline Services Group (SSG), located in the Coachella Valley, California, and Ms. Knight of the City of Phoenix, as well as an open discussion period. The workshop was well attended by representatives of manufacturers and by municipal representatives familiar with sweeper operations and with environmental issues. The manufacturers in attendance included Athey, Elgin, Johnston, Schwarze, Tennant, and Tymco. Representatives of local dealers also attended.

The presentation at the workshop by Mr. Tisopulos of the SCAQMD included a schedule for the development of the test protocol and the certification test, which had been delayed but is now expected to be completed in the first half of 1999. The date by which the procurement of PM₁₀ Efficient Street Sweepers would be required of municipalities was postponed by the SCAQMD to January 1, 2000 from January 1, 1999. Mr. Tisopulos has since confirmed that SCAQMD released the Request for Proposals for the testing of the sweepers on schedule. The tests are scheduled to occur in the spring of 1999.

Mr. Clapper of SSG provided a detailed review at the workshop of street sweeper operations in the Coachella Valley. He reported generally positive experience with the Tymco sweepers that his organization obtained using funding provided under the federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality program. The successful experience was attributed in part to careful maintenance by SSG

of the sweepers. Mr. Clapper provided for reference a 4-inch binder of materials, which members of this Committee may view upon request.

Ms. Knight provided an overview at the workshop of technical issues that are of concern to local municipalities regarding the sweepers to be certified to the new standard. A summary sheet was distributed by Ms. Knight at the workshop to facilitate discussion. An updated version of the summary sheet, which incorporates comments received at the workshop, was distributed to members of Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee.

To complete the report on the results of the Workshop, next steps were summarized. The first step is to wait for the California SCAQMD to complete the development of the certification test and for manufacturers to certify sweepers to that new standard. After that, a field test of available sweepers will be conducted. This field test, to be conducted locally, will be designed considering the technical issues and criteria identified at the workshop.

Ms. Grey asked if the test protocol addressed how the sweepers were dumped, which is an operation that could cause PM₁₀ fugitive emissions. Mr. Voigt indicated that the test protocol does not specifically address dumping. Ms. Knight added that the planned field test could address this issue.

6. Legislative Update

Ms. Bauer provided an update on air quality bills that are under consideration by the Arizona Legislature in the 1999 session. The bills currently under review address lawnmowers, penalties for failure to meet goals for conversion to alternative fuels, a motor vehicle pollution tax based on emission fees calculated using data from the vehicle emission inspection and maintenance program, CARB diesel or similar fuel requirements, and an Alternate Commute Grant Program (HB 2151). Brian Jungwirth, Regional Public Transportation Authority, provided a copy of a fact sheet for HB 2151 to each member of the Committee.

7. Call to The Public

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee. No comments were received.

8. Next Committee Meeting

The next meeting of the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee is tentatively scheduled for March 11, 1999.